

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/811,285	Applicant(s) KAJINO ET AL.	
	Examiner Sylvia R. MacArthur	Art Unit 1763	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-8,21 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-8,21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 1/27/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The recitation of height of the lower/upper guide members are considered, however the prior art of Kajino et al or Adachi Hideki (JP 11-087294) features upper and lower guide members whose heights are adjustable. The prior art does not specifically teach that the recovery ducts form a vertical opening wider than a distance between the rotating base and the atmosphere cutoff plate and a vertical thickness of the atmosphere cutoff plate and a vertical thickness of the rotating base are provided such that a lower surface of the lower guide member is set not lower than a level of the lower surface of the rotating base and a level of a top surface of the upper guide member is set not higher than a level of a top surface of the atmosphere cutoff plate. These recitations are interpreted as a matter of optimization and how the upper/lower guide members, cutoff plate, and recovery ducts are adjusted, sized, and/or dimensioned. The courts have held that where the only difference between the prior art and the claimed is a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device is not patentably distinct from the prior art device, *In re Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 US 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984). Additionally, where the general conditions of the claim are disclosed (in this case the structurally components are present in the prior art), it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have determined the optimum values of the relevant parameters through routine experimentation in the

Art Unit: 1763

absence of a showing of criticality, In re Aller, 220 F. 2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Furthermore, applicant refers to a telephone interview wherein the current amendments were indicated as allowable. Upon review of her records, no such indication has been found. Additionally, in the previous response to the remarks the examiner indicated that the arguments responded to limitations that have not been claimed as yet. At that time, the examiner also stated that the limitations if entered would be interpreted as a matter of optimization. Below are rejections that follow the examiner's reasoning of a prima facie case of obviousness for the amended claims, as applicant has not provided a showing of criticality of the dimensions as recited nor a discussion of why these adjustments/dimensions are nonobvious.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 3-5, 7,8, 21, and 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kajino et al (US 6,793,769).

Regarding claims 3: Kajino et al teaches a substrate processing apparatus. The apparatus comprises a holding element (holding pins 4), a rotation element (plate-like spin base 3), an atmosphere cutoff plate (atmosphere shielding part 60), a splash prevention element including

Art Unit: 1763

recovery ducts 22a-c, a plurality of guiding members including upper and lower guide members (30) and a selection element as discussed in col. 6 lines 53-col. 7 line 26.

Kajino et al further teaches the spacing of the guide members in col.6 lines 46-65. A discussion of the use of the selection element is cited in col. 6 line 53- col. 7 line 52. The proximity of the guiding member, recovery duct cut off plate, and rotating base is illustrated in Fig.1 and col. 10 lines 4-14. The prior art does not specifically teach that the recovery ducts form a vertical opening wider than a distance between the rotating base and the atmosphere cutoff plate and a vertical thickness of the atmosphere cutoff plate and a vertical thickness of the rotating base are provided such that a lower surface of the lower guide member is set not lower than a level of the lower surface of the rotating base and a level of a top surface of the upper guide member is set not higher than a level of a top surface of the atmosphere cutoff plate. These recitations are interpreted as a matter of optimization and how the upper/lower guide members, cutoff plate, and recovery ducts are adjusted, sized, and/or dimensioned. The courts have held that where the only difference between the prior art and the claimed is a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device is not patentably distinct from the prior art device, *In re Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 US 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984). Additionally, where the general conditions of the claim are disclosed (in this case the structurally components are present in the prior art), it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have determined the optimum values of the relevant parameters through routine experimentation in the

Art Unit: 1763

absence of a showing of criticality, In re Aller, 220 F. 2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

The motivation to provide the structural components at the specified dimensions is that the recovery ducts will work at optimal capacity to ensure the treatment fluids are exhausted from the system in a selective manner as intended. Thus, it would have been obvious at the time of the claimed invention to optimize the thickness of the cutoff plate and rotating base along with the dimension of the vertical opening as recited.

Regarding claim 4: See Fig. 1.

Regarding claim 5: See element 23 of Fig.1.

Regarding claim 7: The rotating base and atmosphere cut-off plate each have a disk-like shape and the edge portions facing recovery ducts are vertical side surfaces see Fig. 1 that spin chuck 1 has a plate-like disk-like shape and the respective edge portions facing a plurality of recovery ducts are vertical side surfaces see col. 5 line 35, see also Fig.1

Regarding claim 8: See Fig. 1.

Regarding claims 21 and 22: Note the height of the guide member is adjustable and thus setting the height "not higher" than the level of a top surface of the atmosphere cutoff plate is also a matter of optimization as recited above.

4. Claims 3-5, 7-11, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adachi Hideki (JP 11-087294).

Hideki teaches a substrate processing apparatus. The apparatus comprises a holding element (substrate attachment components 4), a rotation element (spin base 3), an atmosphere cutoff plate (atmosphere shielding member 60), a splash prevention element including recovery

Art Unit: 1763

ducts 22a-c, a plurality of guiding members (30) and a selection element as discussed in section [0044]. The prior art does not specifically teach that the recovery ducts form a vertical opening wider than a distance between the rotating base and the atmosphere cutoff plate and a vertical thickness of the atmosphere cutoff plate and a vertical thickness of the rotating base are provided such that a lower surface of the lower guide member is set not lower than a level of the lower surface of the rotating base and a level of a top surface of the upper guide member is set not higher than a level of a top surface of the atmosphere cutoff plate. These recitations are interpreted as a matter of optimization and how the upper/lower guide members, cutoff plate, and recovery ducts are adjusted, sized, and/or dimensioned. The courts have held that where the only difference between the prior art and the claimed is a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device is not patentably distinct from the prior art device, *In re Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 US 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984). Additionally, where the general conditions of the claim are disclosed (in this case the structural components are present in the prior art), it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have determined the optimum values of the relevant parameters through routine experimentation in the absence of a showing of criticality, *In re Aller*, 220 F. 2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

The motivation to provide the structural components at the specified dimensions is that the recovery ducts will work at optimal capacity to ensure the treatment fluids are exhausted from the system in a selective manner as intended. Thus, it would have been obvious at the time

Art Unit: 1763

of the claimed invention to optimize the thickness of the cutoff plate and rotating base along with the dimension of the vertical opening as recited.

Regarding claims 3 Hideki teaches the spacing of the guide members in the abstract. A discussion of the use of the selection element is cited in section [0044] and in claim 3. The proximity of the guiding member, recovery duct cut off plate, and rotating base is illustrated in Figs.1 and 7, see also the abstract.

Regarding claims 4 and 10 See Fig. 1.

Regarding claims 5 and 11 See Fig.1.

Regarding claim 7: The rotating base and atmosphere cut-off plate each have a disk-like shape and the edge portions facing recovery ducts are vertical side surfaces see Fig. 1 that spin chuck 1 has a plate-like disk-like shape and the respective edge portions facing a plurality of recovery ducts are vertical side surfaces see Fig.1

Regarding claim 8: See Fig. 1.

Regarding claims 21 and 22: Note the height of the guide member is adjustable and thus setting the height "not higher" than the level of a top surface of the atmosphere cutoff plate is also a matter of optimization as recited above.

5. Claims 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adachi Hideki in view of Tsuchiya et al (6,810,888).

The teachings of Hideki were discussed above.

Hideki fails to teach a suck element.

Art Unit: 1763

Tsuchiya et al teaches a sucking element in col. 7 lines 9-38 and col. 8 lines 33-55. The motivation to provide the sucking element in the recovery ducts is it ensures a reduced pressure to be maintained in the fluid flow paths 36.

Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to provide a suck element in the recovery ducts as taught by Tsuchiya et al in the apparatus of Hideki et al.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sylvia R. MacArthur whose telephone number is 571-272-1438. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F during the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m.

Art Unit: 1763

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on 571-272-1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Sylvia R MacArthur
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1763

April 16, 2007